

Germany. European shoe repairmen have two main advantages over repairmen in this country, he said. Manufacturers and repairmen work together to solve their problems there. European shoe repairing has been elevated to the status of a profession. This is because the best shoe repairmen were selected by royalty to make and repair their shoes, Gardner said.

Foreign shoes on the whole are better constructed since more leather is used, he said.

Gardner said he was impressed with the leather show which included 840 booths with 500,000 people attending. He carried greetings from several organizations and dignitaries to the convention. While in Paris, he had a private interview with the president of the Paris Chamber of Commerce.

In his speech, Gardner traced the development of many shoe repair machines and pointed out that 40 million pairs of shoes are imported into the United States each year.

"These machines have all but eliminated hand-nailing in the shops," he said. "Unlike European shops, U.S. repairmen are spread out in more shops. In round figures, we have around 30,000 repair shops," Gardner told the delegates.

He told of his campaign for labeling shoes. The labeling guides will cover labeling in general, simulated leather or imitation, concealed parts, split leather, embossed and processed leather, ground or shredded leather, heels, and disclosures in advertising. It will affect about 800 shoe manufacturers, he said.

"I feel a man must be proud of his trade and believe he is needed and wanted in our modern civilization before he will begin to advance to the top of his profession," Gardner said.

Expressing the Determination of the United States With Respect to the Situation in Cuba

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 230, expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, the question of Castro and Cuba is the overriding problem involving the Communist menace, as far as the United States is concerned.

We recognize, of course, that the ultimate responsibility for our foreign policy lies with the President, under our Constitution. The people of the United States has always patriotically pitched in and supported their Presidents when there has been a showdown, and will do so again.

Nevertheless, Congress, in representing the people, recognizes that it, as well as the individual Members of Congress, has a right and a duty to express itself on matters in which the people are so vitally interested and concerned.

This is evidenced by the action so recently taken by the House, in amending the foreign aid appropriation bill so

as to prohibit foreign aid gifts to those countries which furnish arms, ammunition, or other materials of war to Cuba, or whose ships carry supplies to Cuba.

It is sentiment of the U.S. Congress, at least insofar as the House of Representatives is concerned, that Castro and communism in Cuba should receive no encouragement in a continuation of the subjugation of the Cuban people, and no aid in building Cuba as a missile base or operations bastion for Communist action against the United States or the Western Hemisphere.

To express this sentiment, the House so amended the foreign aid appropriation bill. Now, we find our Secretary of State objecting to these amendments. In effect, he is saying that it is not in the interest of the United States to oppose the Communist military buildup in Cuba. He would have us continue giving aid to foreign lands, that they may be in a position to continue aiding and abetting Castro and communism.

I certainly do not want to leave the impression only one person is the cause of our dilemma—our same Department of State, but under another Secretary and another administration, was the installing officer in placing Castro, a known Communist for many years, in control of Cuba.

That was 4 years ago; the Communist regimes of Europe and Asia immediately began sending men and supplies into Cuba, building bases, which has continued to the present day. Yet our Government would not even admit this fact, until only a few weeks ago when everyone already knew it.

And even until this good day, our Government has not once officially protested to Khrushchev, or any other government.

Under these circumstances, with the Russian arms buildup continuing, is it any wonder that the U.S. Congress, as the representatives of the people, desire in some way to make their official protest to Khrushchev, in the absence of such a protest from the executive department? Weak though our protest may be, there is no alternative but to support it. Khrushchev must know that the representatives of the American people do not condone his invasion of our hemisphere and the consequent great threat to our freedom from the naval and missile bases in Cuba.

Without some protest from this country, it is no wonder that Khrushchev told Robert Frost, the poet, that Americans have become too liberal to fight to protect themselves; neither is it surprising that he told Stewart Udall, our Secretary of the Interior, that he was convinced the United States will take no action in opposition to the Soviet Union in Cuba.

These stated impressions of Khrushchev could only have been magnified and probably confirmed in his mind by two subsequent events.

The first of these occurred in Italy. Italian seaman refused to operate two Italian ships which were loaded with Russian and Italian supplies for Castro. A National Maritime Union official in New York revealed that the U.S. labor

attaché at Rome was urging the Italian Government to force the seamen to sail the two ships to Cuba.

The U.S. Department of State has previously stopped boycotts against Castro shipping out of U.S. ports.

Even though our Government is supposedly pressuring other countries to stop their ships from carrying Russian supplies to Castro, our officials try to interfere with any attempts to boycott Castro's supply line. That alone would cause Khrushchev to harden his belief that the United States will not oppose the continuation of his takeover in the American countries, but in addition to that, there is the latest announcement that Russia is building a naval base in Cuba—and again, no official protest from our Government. The announcement was the construction of a base for fishing vessels, but it will also accommodate war vessels and submarines.

The State Department has finally publicly recognized the Russian takeover in Cuba, but still persists in minimizing the amount of military support being furnished, in spite of correspondent's reports of Russian and satellite troops headed by a Russian major general.

Other nations are also beginning to share Khrushchev's opinion of America's actions. They have learned there is no way to appease or reason with a Communist. We certainly should have learned it long ago.

The way Khrushchev has taken over in Cuba is an illustration. Four years ago, he sent in Czechoslovakians and Chinese Reds to build airbases. Even I was informed of it at the time, as it was well known I had branded Castro as a Communist even before our then State Department helped him into control of Cuba. Getting away with that, Khrushchev now has missile bases, air bases, a naval and submarine base abuilding, and at least 10,000 Reds in Cuba. It is no longer Castro's Cuba—it is Khrushchev's "Kuba"—a servile Communist satellite. There are now 5,000 well-armed Communist troops patrolling the boundaries of our naval base at Guantanamo. And Khrushchev, in his belief that America now really is too liberal to defend itself, is daring us to do something about it. He approves of revolutions to overthrow freedom, but brands counterrevolutions to restore freedom as being aggression. Sometimes there is cause to wonder if our State Department officials might have similar beliefs.

Spokesmen for our Government suggest the Monroe Doctrine will be applicable only if Soviet arms in Cuba become offensive, or if directed against other American nations. The truth is, the Monroe Doctrine was breached when Cuba was taken over by Russia. Russia regards this as a retreat on our part. Successive retreats will make Khrushchev bolder, just as happened with Hitler more than 20 years ago, when he finally decided that England would not fight at all, but would continue to make concessions.

We, as Representatives of the people, must register our protest, and our determination to preserve the Monroe Doctrine.

October 3

A7292

The Result in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very impressed with editorial comments on the situation in Mississippi as printed in three of South Carolina's leading daily newspapers. The editorials are entitled "The Result in Mississippi," from the October 2, 1962, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C.; "The Mob in Mississippi," from the October 2, 1962, issue of the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C.; and "Digest of Anarchy, Called Rights," from the October 2, 1962, issue of the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State Oct. 2, 1962]

THE RESULT IN MISSISSIPPI

Overpowering instruments from the storehouse of Federal authority have delivered in Mississippi another severe blow to the once respected rights of the States of the American Union.

That the effectiveness of this blow was predestined by judicial decisions takes no luster from Mississippi's resistance. Neither does it dim the surviving principle of those elsewhere who, with so much warrant, deplore the decline of the States. It is another demonstration of what has happened to this country in the way of accumulated central power, with a corresponding weakening of the States.

Gov. Ross Barnett, without surrendering principle, eventually had to concede in Mississippi. Every door to his resistance had been closed, the last by exercise of Federal physical force. He really had no alternative.

It could scarcely have been expected, in view of the strong stand of Mississippi's leadership and the natural convictions and passions of the people in such a situation, that the change could have been brought about easily. Violence eventually erupted. Some, including individuals from outside Mississippi, turned that State's valiance into a violence which had no good result or effect.

Mississippi's leadership has provided for the history books of the future a page to record a strong and resolved last-ditch try at heading off Federal power.

As unhappy as President Kennedy and his counseling associates may have become over the defiance in Mississippi, they should not gloat in their victory. They would do well to reexamine the structure of our Union and think more studiously and more tolerantly over what has happened to the rights of the States as reflected by the 10th amendment. It undoubtedly is not to be expected that the Federal Government in this, or perhaps any, generation will come down from its position on the desegregation of publicly operated educational institutions. But the remembrance of Mississippi should survive and tend to temper action in instances of the future.

In this very week hearings will be continued in the Federal court in the case of a Negro who has applied for admission to a public segregated college in this State.

Many a South Carolinian who has entertained a lifelong devotion to the doctrine of the rights of the States is not assuaged by the outcome in Mississippi, an outcome compelled by the Federal force they sincerely deplore.

The changes decreed for these times hit with particular force in the South. The reflex to that in the Southern States is proportionate. The traditional structure is being knocked down with force. The South is challenged to adapt on a difficult issue, one more influenced by politics than the force of social justice. The struggle is now in the core of the South as distinguished from the border States. There is a difference, as Mississippi has shown.

When the contesting reaches the point of physical force, that of the Federal Government is overwhelming, as Governor Barnett said in what he will remember as the fateful autumn of the year 1962.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier, Oct. 2, 1962]

THE MOB IN MISSISSIPPI

Like mob fury everywhere, violence and bloodshed in Mississippi are dreadful to behold. Nothing short of bayonets and tear gas could quell such fury as followed the smuggling of a Negro onto the campus of Ole Miss.

The quiet town of Oxford has become the scene of bloodshed, death and hatred that people everywhere deplore. U.S. troops battled townsfolk in the streets to restore order.

Had the Mississippi rioters been Algerians fighting the French, or Congo savages slaughtering white Europeans, American liberals might have cheered them on. But they are freeborn white Americans. Though their anger erupted with the same senseless violence that sweeps through any mob, their resentment has a deep foundation in the history of the Republic. The bayonets that are mopping up pockets of resistance in Oxford are the same weapons that hold down freedom fighters in Hungary and elsewhere in this troubled world.

Constitutional niceties are hard to discern when rioters try to kill reporters at the scene of a dramatic conflict. In one case they succeeded in snuffing out the life of a newspaper man. Ironically he was a foreigner, come to write about the ordeal of a republic now going through the throes of internal strife.

Bloody resistance to forced integration has been predicted for years by sober Southerners. Headstrong politicians who put bloc minority votes ahead of the peaceful administration of law have provoked this shameful episode. As a late Mississippi editor once proclaimed, bloodstains are on the steps of the Supreme Court.

Will helicopters, troops, and marshals succeed in forcing Negro students into every white school and college of the South? If so, can they keep them there while normal education proceeds? Is this region to become an armed camp, a zone of occupation by American armies?

The urge to force white southerners to accept racial mingling in itself has become a kind of mob spirit. Though it was pressed in Mississippi with soldierly discipline and under cover of legality, this frenzied determination to run the affairs of local citizens according to a popular fad is a form of organized tyranny. The U.S. Constitution was designed to protect the rights of States and the sanctity of local self-government. Gov. Ross Barnett, in yielding to overwhelming power, was right in telling the Federal Government that it is trampling on the Constitution.

"May God have mercy on their souls," he said in bowing to superior force. "Mississippi will continue to fight the Meredith ease

and all similar cases through the courts to restore the sovereignty of the State and constitutional government."

Other States, we hope and believe, will continue to resist the encroachment on constitutional rights which has become a fixation of the present rulers of the country. Race is not the only issue, nor even the most important, though it is emotionally the most explosive.

The issue actually is protection of rights—human rights, property rights, and the rights of States as contrasted with the power of Central Government at Washington. Though political issues are confused today in both parties, the demonstration of military might at Oxford, Miss., may help to shock the citizens of all regions into realization of the distance down the road that our free country has traveled in recent years.

Granted that other regions, with less racial experience than the South, are unsympathetic to Mississippi's objection to even one Negro on the campus of Ole Miss, Americans everywhere can understand the meaning of a bayonet. Some of the last remnants of the Republic died Sunday at Oxford along with victims of the mob.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Kennedy's Sunday night appeal to the people of Mississippi, and especially to the students of the State university, was a skillful bit of oratory. Had it not been for the realization that he was the one who ordered the act that provoked the mob, his words would carry greater conviction.

Now that the consequences of putting a Negro on the campus have been demonstrated, law-abiding citizens who understand the emotions and pressures involved can only hope that the Federal Government will adopt a more moderate position. Mr. Kennedy's expressed desire to handle the crisis without troops proved ineffectual.

The choice of continuing a campaign to enforce integration at the price of internal strife is up to the White House. With the ever-present peril of Cuba confronting the President, even sincere integrationists ought to realize that national safety should come ahead of what at best is an unproved theory of sociology.

MR. RUSSELL'S POSITION

In approving Governor Barnett's position in Mississippi, Donald Russell reflects the sentiments of the majority of those who voted him in as the next Governor of South Carolina. While Mr. Russell was careful to point out that he is not speaking as a public official, since he has not even been formally elected, much less sworn in as Governor, his expression of personal opinion conforms with the prevailing mood of South Carolina.

The restrained attitude of Gov. Fritz Hollings has raised questions in the minds of outsiders about the feelings of South Carolinians. The Wall Street Journal last week in a summary of southern attitudes said that both Governor Hollings and "his expected successor, Democratic nominee Donald S. Russell * * * have taken moderate desegregation stands."

The reference accompanied the prediction that the State would not attempt to interfere with integration of Clemson College, which now is defendant in a suit by Harvey Gantt, a Negro engineering student.

Mr. Russell has not tried to say what form resistance might take when he is Governor, but he has endorsed the position of the Gressette Committee. This committee has charge of South Carolina's efforts to maintain separation of the races in the interests of both white and colored citizens. So far it has indicated no softening toward mixed schools.